

REMARKS

In the Office Action,¹ the Examiner rejected claims 13-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220995 to Hitaka et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,272,484 to Martin et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent claim 16 recites an information processing method comprising:

- moving the first cursor on the first display unit based on the received user input;

- detecting a movement of the first cursor;

- specifying a new thumbnail picture at a new location of the first cursor;

- transmitting a new thumbnail picture URL associated with the new thumbnail picture from the first viewing apparatus to the second viewing apparatus;

- refreshing the second display unit to display the second cursor at a new location of a new thumbnail picture associated with the new thumbnail picture URL received from the first viewing apparatus.

Hitaka and Martin, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claimed refreshing step.

Hitaka discloses a system in which a user can use a personal computer to send photos to a photo site and to order photos from a print site. [125]. Upon receiving an order start confirmation, the print site acquires a thumbnail image from the photo site server. [332]. After the thumbnail image is acquired, the print site displays the an

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

image select dialog 4400 shown in FIG. 43 in step S4207. [332]. However, the dialog box is displayed on the display of the user's PC. See, [128] ("The print site sends, to the user PC, a dialog used to display the acquired thumbnail image and prompt the user to input detailed print information"). The user can then use this dialog box to enter further details about the order. [325].

Moreover, the Examiner acknowledges, "Hitaka . . . does not explicitly show refreshing the second display unit to display the second cursor at a new location." Office Action, p. 7. Martin also fails to disclose the claimed refreshing step.

Martin discloses a method for managing electronic documents. Abstract. In Martin, thumbnail representations of these documents can be created. Col 7, lines 22-25. A user can then move cursor 509 to select any of the thumbnails displayed. col. 8, lines 6-7; Fig. 5. The electronic document can then be displayed by, for example, opening or refreshing a browser window. Col 12 lines 27-31.

If cursor 509 is considered as the first cursor, in Martin, selecting a thumbnail by moving cursor 509 (first cursor) does not cause another cursor (second cursor) in another device to be displayed at an associated thumbnail. If cursor 509 is considered as the second cursor, in Martin, the thumbnail selected by cursor 509 (second cursor) is selected by the user on the second device and has no association with a thumbnail selected by another cursor (first cursor) moved by a user on the first device. Therefore, Martin does not disclose "refreshing the second display unit to display the second cursor at a new location of a new thumbnail picture associated with the new thumbnail picture URL received from the first viewing apparatus."

For at least the foregoing reasons, Hitaka and Martin, individually or in combination, fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 16. Independent claims 13, 19, 22, 25, and 28 are allowable over Hitaka and Martin for at least reasons similar to those given for claim 16. Dependent claims 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, and 30 are allowable at least due to their dependence from allowable base claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 13-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that this claimed invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the references cited against this application. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 4, 2008

By: 

Michael R. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,921